those of younger ones are more tender.

**alone**, i.e. with the multitude and  
the disciples; the woman standing between  
Him and the disciples on one hand,—and  
the multitude on the other.

**10, 11.]** The question is evidently so  
worded as it is, “*hath no man condemned  
thee*?” for the sake of the form of the  
answer, “*Neither do I condemn thee*:”  
but it expresses the truth in the depth of  
their hearts. The Lord’s challenge to  
them would lead to a condemnation *by  
comparison* with themselves, if they con-  
demned at all: which they had not done.  
The words of Jesus were in fact a far  
deeper and more solemn testimony against  
the sin than could be any mere penal  
sentence. And in judging of then we  
must never forget that He who thus  
spoke knew the hearts,—and what was  
the peculiar state of this woman as to  
penitence. We must not apply in all cases  
a sentence, which requires *His divine  
knowledge* to make it a just one.]

——————————

12–59] THE CONFLICT BETWEEN JESUS AND THE JEWS, AT ITS HEIGHT

12–20] *Testimony to Himself as the Light.*

12.] The attempts of Bengel, Stier, and others, to establish a connexion with the passage concerning the women taken in adultery are forced and harsh. It was, say they, the early morning (ver. 2) and the sun was rising, to which these words *“the light of the world”* allude,—and the walking in darkness is an allusion to the woman, whose deed of darkness had been detected in the  
night. But not to dwell on other objections to this view,—e.g. that such an  
allusion to the woman would be wholly  
out of character after our Lord’s previous  
treatment of her,—how come these Pharisees, who on the hypothesis of the above Commentators are *the same as those who  
accused the woman, to be again so soon present?* Was this at all likely? We cannot escape from this difficulty with Stier, by  
supposing a multitude of the people to  
have been witnesses on both occasions:  
the “*Pharisees*” of the one must surely  
extend through the other, if *this connexion* is to be maintained.

On the  
other hand, this discourse comes in very  
well after ch. vii. 52. The last saying of  
Jesus (ch. vii. 37, 38) had referred to a  
festal usage then just over; He now adds  
another of the same kind. It was the custom during the first night, if not during  
every night, of the feast of tabernacles,  
to light up two large golden chandeliers  
in the court of the women, the light of  
which illuminated all Jerusalem. All that  
night they held a festal dance by the light.

Now granted that this was on the  
first night only,—what is there improbable  
in the supposition that our Lord—standing  
in the very place where the candlesticks  
had been or perhaps actually were—should have alluded to that practice, as  
He did to the outpouring of water in ch.  
vii. 87, 38? Surely to say in both cases,  
as Lücke and De Wette do, that the allusion could not have been made unless the usage *took place on that day*, is mere  
trifling. *While the feast lasted*, and the  
remembrance of the ceremonies was fresh,  
the allusion would be perfectly natural.  
See on ch. i. 9, and xi. 9, 10. Sce also  
Isa. xlii. 6; Mal. iv. 2; and on “*the light  
of life*,” ch. i. 4, and vi. 48.

**13.]** See  
ch. v. 31. The assertion *there* was, that  
His own *unsupported* witness (*supposing  
that possible*) would not be trustworthy,  
but that His testimony was supported by,  
and in fact coincident with, that of the  
Father. The very same argument is here  
used, but *the other side of it* presented to  
us. He *does* witness of Himself, because  
His testimony is the testimony of the  
Father;—He being the *Word of God*, and  
the Father *witnessing in Him*.

**14.]  
because I know**, &c.—see on ch. vii. 29.  
This reason binds His testimony to that of  
the Father; for He came forth from the